DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 198 HE 013 303

AUTHOR Whitcomb, David B.: Beck, Louis L.
TITLE Institutional Mission and Faculty Development.
PUB DATE 1 Dec 80
NOTE 16p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for Social Studies (New Orleans, LA, December, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty: *College Role: Consultation Programs: Declining Enrollment: Departments: *Faculty Development: Higher Education: Individual Development: Inservice Teacher Education: *Instructional Development: *Organizational Development: Retrenchment: State Colleges: Student Characteristics: *Student Needs: Teacher Morale
IDENTIFIERS *California State University Long Beach

ABSTRACT

Faculty development is considered in relation to student needs through instructional development, faculty needs through personal and professional development, and the needs of the institution through a focus on organizational development. Faculty development strategies implemented at California State University, Long Beach, have addressed the need to provide augmented learning for faculty in declining departments to teach part-time in areas of high enrollment, the need for faculty renewal and revitalization, and the need to assist faculty in improving their organizational competence within academic departments and the larger organizational body. One approach to organizational development has been a consultative service to academic departments interested in conducting a departmental self-study. Environmental factors that affect college faculty and the institutions include greater choices available to students and a diversified student body, including adult students. These new environmental forces and changing expectations of colleges lead to the need to reexamine the purposes of the institutions, as well as assisting faculty of declining departments to develop secondary teaching areas. Faculty retraining activities at California State University, Long Beach, are noted, and vignettes of faculty are provided as illustrations. The Inter-Campus Faculty Consultation Program for Instructional Improvement is also described. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David B. Whitcomb
Louis L. Beck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED195198

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

by

David B. Whitcomb
and Louis L. Beck

Too often the term "faculty development" is thought of narrowly as instructional improvement. Early on in my career, I found that a wider definition of this term was more useful. Francis (1975) defined faculty development as "an institutional process which seeks to modify the attitudes, skills, and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting *student needs, their own needs, and the needs of the institution.*"[1] (Italics mine.) If we care, then, about assisting faculty within our institutions, we should give deep attention to all fronts, that is, (1) student needs through instructional development, (2) faculty needs through personal/professional development, and (3) the needs of the institution through a focus on organizational development.

I want to share with you some faculty development strategies which have been useful to us at California State University, Long Beach, where we have had a Center for Faculty Development for six years. Our initial rationale for establishing the program was to provide assistance to faculty in the area of instructional improvement. It was a role we soon realized could not be separated from other concerns. More recent institutional motivations include:

HE013303

---

[1] J. B. Francis, "How Do We Get There from Here?--Program Design for Faculty Development," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 46 (November/December 1975), 719.

1. The need to provide augmented learning for faculty in declining departments to teach part-time in areas of high enrollment;
2. The need for faculty renewal and revitalization in a time when new blood and new resources are scarce; and
3. The need to assist faculty in improving their organizational competence within academic departments and, at the same time, as members of a complex, interdependent social system--nice words for a bureaucracy.

I will share with you some of the organizational development models which have been successful. I will then discuss a few of the environmental factors to which we have had to respond, after which I will mention some of what we have learned in our faculty augmented learning (faculty retraining) project since August of 1978. I will conclude with two approaches to faculty renewal which seem to have high payoffs.

Organization Development, perhaps the least used of the major areas of faculty development, focuses on departments, divisions, schools, and campuses. The concern here is to enhance the functioning of the organizational unit, thereby eliminating unnecessary barriers to effective teaching and learning. The purposes of organizational development are to improve communication within the various departments or work groups, to clarify motivation, and to teach participatory decision making and conflict resolution.

At California State University, Long Beach, an important component of the Center is a consultative service to academic departments interested in conducting a departmental self-study. The Center provides a consultant

to work with the department faculty in all phases of this three-to-four month data feedback process.

This process assumes the department has the motivation, for whatever set of reasons, to collect a considerable amount of data and spend some time in feedback and action planning sessions. With the dozen departments which have been involved in this process to date, motivation has stemmed in whole or in part from dropping enrollment, pressure for curricular change, some external (perceived) threat to their operation, an upcoming accreditation review, a civil war, and so on.

Data are gathered from their own faculty, from key administrators, students, and recent graduates through individual interviews, group interviews, and survey questionnaires. A feedback session is held for the faculty, at which time the data are highlighted. Implications of the data are discussed and an action plan for departmental improvement is outlined. Where possible, department faculty groups have scheduled a one-day retreat to provide uninterrupted time for this feedback session.

The benefits to such departments have varied, depending upon the original motivation of the group. These benefits have included:

1. A decision to involve all faculty (34) in small group discussion on teaching issues and faculty development;
2. A follow-up three-hour workshop on "Handling Conflict in the Department";
3. A series of discussion sessions for faculty on the future of the department;
4. A one-day retreat to explore curriculum revision and revitalization;

5. A teambuilding retreat for all faculty of the department with an outside facilitator; and

6. An all-day, long-range planning session.

In past years, each time our Center was asked to help a department conduct a self-study, we reinvented the wheel. We began, almost from scratch, to develop the questionnaires and the interview schedules. Our campus has just launched an Organizational Renewal Project with the American Council on Education's Higher Education Management Institute (HEMI). We are pleased to find that this program is based on the organizational development principles we have found successful. But the advantage of the HEMI program is that the institute has already developed the materials and processes needed for this type of survey feedback approach.

Established as a management development and training program, this project provides as much promise for the development of faculty as for administrators, given its processes and institution-wide aspects. Also, a sensory mechanism is provided as a means for utilizing feedback data to develop action plans. Some three dozen training modules are received by each participating institution. These are useful with faculty groups, as well as with groups of administrators.[2]

Environmental Forces and Institutional Responses

It may well be that many of the environmental forces which seem to bode ill for higher education may have more positive than negative

---

[2]Richard S. Webster has described this project in "A New Approach to Institutional Renewal: Management Development and Training for Colleges and Universities," in Administrative Development in Higher Education, edited by John Shtogren (Richmond, Va.: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, Inc., 1978).

impact. One fundamental change is the degree to which student choice is reshaping our institutions of higher education. The array of student choices is great. Some of those new elements are:

1. They have more alternatives from which to choose, higher education being one of the possibilities;
2. Their choice of institutions is broader than at any previous time;
3. Their choice of possible programs is likewise broader; and
4. Social pressures to go to college are diminishing.

This represents a fundamental role reversal. Before, faculty were meting out these educational opportunities. Now students are more free to choose. Faculty must adapt to this new set of circumstances; they must be more responsive to student needs and interests.

The changing needs of the student body further complicate this situation. There is greater diversity in our students--a higher percentage of women, ethnics, and adults.

Adult Students

At CSULB, 38% of our 31,000 students are adults; that is, they are older than our traditional 18 to 24-year-olds. When we talk about this broad age group of those 25 years and older, we are talking about people who are caught up in commitments and situations more important to them than is their interest in higher education. They don't see themselves as students primarily; they see themselves as persons who happen to be taking a course or more at the university. They are secretaries, lab technicians, managers, wives, husbands, parents, etc. These people tend to have learning preferences somewhat different from the "assumed"

preferences of the under-25 group.

1. They prefer problem-oriented educational experiences which provide opportunities to apply the theories presented.
2. They prefer to have some control over their learning experiences.
3. They like to be seen as persons with a set of experiences which are valued, and as learners they want to relate these experiences to the new material being presented.
4. They prefer opportunities to interact with faculty and with the ideas that are important.
5. They value class discussions when students come to class well prepared.

I believe a growing number of faculty have a new sense of challenge in a changing academia. I will share with you some of the opportunities and positive impacts which I have observed.

Re-examination of Purposes

The new environmental forces and the changing expectations of our services by the students and by society at large cause us to re-examine the purposes of our institutions. Russell Edgerton recently reminded us that there are three places for academic leaders to turn for information as to the purposes of their institutions: "They can look to the changing nature and interests of incoming students. They can look to the changing requirements of the society these students will enter. And they can look to their own history, traditions,

commitments, and abilities as educators."[3]

Reconceptualization of Our Role as Faculty

Another benefit accruing from environmental changes has resulted from our work in assisting faculty of shrinking departments to develop secondary teaching areas. Though the number of faculty involved in such "retraining" or "augmented learning" is quite small, we have learned a good deal from the experiments. For one thing, faculty tend to become more aware that their role and skills as instructors have more transferability than they had imagined. Additionally, faculty involved in retraining efforts experience a sense of renewal. One person in a follow-up interview talked about "the joy of teaching undergraduates for the first time in a long while." Another person stated that the retraining process had led to the most enjoyable experience he has ever had in teaching.

Faculty Retraining is an important staff alternative being considered by institutions with departments with both high tenure density and dropping student enrollment. I would like here to discuss some of the initial findings of our faculty retraining effort at California State University, Long Beach. Twenty-five faculty were given 25% released time to prepare to teach courses outside of their disciplinary areas. The activities of the retraining project included:

1. A two-hour seminar once each week,
2. Classroom observation one to three hours per week,
3. Preparation of a content outline and a course

---

[3]Russell Edgerton, "Talent for the 1980s--Social Change and the Redefinition of Baccalaureate Education," Liberal Education, Vol. 64, No. 4 (December 1978), 418.

syllabus, and

4. A certification process by the receiving department.

Our seminar retraining groups were for courses in English Composition, Technical Writing, Popular Arts in America, and Introduction to Religion. Faculty in retraining were from the departments of History, Geography, German, Philosophy, and Education.

The seminars of the retraining project encouraged participating faculty to focus on dimensions of teaching which they had not previously considered. Some faculty reported new insights in regard to the relationship between method and content. One reported that her position on grading had been altered considerably by the retraining experience.

The Faculty Retraining Project represented a healthy challenge to the disciplinary boundaries which divide the university and seal off its separate units. Faculty valued the opportunity to be meeting and learning with people across departmental, school, and disciplinary boundaries. One dean said, "The project is breaking down the chauvinism of the disciplines." And a faculty member stated: There is being cultivated within the university a new sense of interdependence."

What did we learn from the process?

1. It is relatively easy for faculty to make the transition to a skills course like English Composition or Technical Writing.
2. It is difficult for faculty to accept a new content area if there is also some expectation for altering one's usual course design or methodology.
3. The voluntary participation of faculty is an absolute must. In a few cases where faculty were strongly

encouraged by deans or department chairs to participate, the retraining process was not successful.

4. One general assumption is that the faculty retraining process might be particularly useful in preparing faculty to teach in interdisciplinary general education courses which they themselves develop. Evergreen State College in Olympia, Washington, has received grants to engage in this kind of curriculum development/faculty development work. At CSULB we are in the developmental phase of such a project.

Personal/Professional Development

A comprehensive faculty development program should also focus on the personal/professional needs of faculty. Regina Kyle's article, "Faculty in the 80's: Memory, Desire, Signs," points toward the condition of faculty as we enter the eighties. "There is a malaise of spirit, a sense of a lost world which cannot be recovered, that shrouds the vision of some faculty at research universities as well as in two- and four-year colleges."[4] Processes must be developed which will help faculty transcend this malaise and find a new sense of mission, new sources of motivation.

Perhaps it would be useful to share with you a few vignettes of faculty who have been uniquely involved in their own development and, as a result, have had an impact on the development of other faculty.

Professor Jones, let's call him. A full professor, age 59. Two years ago he felt a restless itch. He decided to attend a seven-day

---

[4]Regina M. J. Kyle, "Faculty in the 80's: Memory, Desire, Signs," Trends 2000, Faculty and the Eighties, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Winter 1979), 3.

workshop on career exploration. This event was being conducted over 3000 miles away, but he'd heard good reports of the value of this workshop. He participated and returned with the strong suggestion that such a workshop should be available on our campus for young Ph.D.'s without tenure and "old restless Ph.D.'s" with second thoughts and new stirrings. Well, we located a person with expertise in this particular approach, and Professor Jones assisted with a weekend workshop. It was successful. Professor Jones has subsequently spent additional time being trained in this process, and last month he led an all-day workshop, or "Job Clinic," on our campus for 14 faculty and staff. His new part-time career is opening up to him.

Vignette #2. A full professor in the History Department would come by occasionally to share a new idea. We had heard from students that Professor Smith, let's call him, is a dynamic person in the classroom. We asked if we could tape a lecture and use it as one of a number of models of teaching styles. I would like to show just a 5-minute clip from a 12-minute video vignette which we took from this lecture. I show it here to lead into another point I'd like to make.

(Shown John Walzer 5 minutes.)

This is one of 9 or 10 video vignettes featuring particular faculty members. Subsequent to our completing this tape, the fellow you just saw came by our Center and began talking about an idea. He was intrigued by the teaching style of a person in the English Department who teaches poetry writing. Our friend John said he'd like an opportunity to dialogue with the English prof about this problem of the relationship of one's life to the classroom situation. We organized a seminar on the topic, "Bringing One's Life to the Classroom: Problems and Payoffs." Nearly

50 faculty came, and a stimulating dialogue was followed by an excellent discussion. We videotaped both and make them available for faculty who could not attend.

Vignette #3. A professor of photography has been active with our Center these last two years. His interest in photography expanded to a deep interest in how his students think and learn. Without losing either of these two earlier interests, he became very interested in split brain research and the possible implications of this research for our teaching. Through his efforts we have had three seminars which focused on this topic. Through all of this, our photography professor has become particularly interested in himself as learner, in his self who sees the world differently than when he first entered the profession some 15 years ago. He is an exciting and stimulating guy.

I share with you three three vignettes to make a few points:

- Faculty today need opportunities to experiment with the "restless itch" in their lives.
- Faculty today need some support for taking new risks, tilling new soil. And the support cannot always be found in the academic department.
- Faculty today need to explore and compare their original reasons for choosing this profession in the light of current payoffs. Perhaps aspects of the lost world are recoverable.

Whether we're engaged in instructional development or organizational development, the real goal is the personal/professional development of the faculty members. Their vitality, excitement, motivation, and enthusiasm have a great deal to do with the quality of what happens

in the classroom.

Another project we've been involved in for three years is an Inter-Campus Faculty Consultation Program for Instructional Improvement, in cooperation with California State University, Northridge. This project provides a method for faculty from the two campuses to have another member visit their classrooms and provide feedback on instructional practices. The program functions completely outside the promotion and tenure processes. Two to three dozen faculty from each campus are involved each year.

An evaluation study of the project was conducted each of the three years it ran. A summary of the evaluation data shows about 90% of the participating faculty saw the experience as either quite valuable or very valuable. Central to our notion of the evaluation of this project were the values derived from the particular experience of each faculty member. The administrative arrangements, though of secondary importance, were guided by the hope that valuable and collaborative interactions would take place. That was what the project directors had hoped, and this is what they got in response:

> sharing awareness of competences . . . reawakening of teaching role . . . non-threatening observer . . . mutually benefitting . . . awareness of other styles . . . opportunity to assist and to provide recognition . . . focus on objective evaluation outside of contaminated arena of Personnel . . . opportunity for both reinforcement and improvement . . . opportunity to meet people and discuss teaching out of the environment of Retention and Promotion . . . inter-campus sense of common aims and problems . . . professional feedback from competent observer . . . improved perception of student response . . . clearer picture of myself as teacher . . . peer appraisal was highly efficacious . . . for the first time, access to someone who would observe my teaching behavior and discuss it with me in an open dialogue . . . ability to discuss teaching with someone who did not have a vested interest in the results . . . a shot in the arm for flagging enthusiasm . . . the met need for a listening ear

> regarding particular personal/professional concerns/ dilemmas was of highest significance . . . first time in fifteen years that a colleague visited my class.

One of the spinoffs of this project is that some departments are now doing more classroom visitation. Up until recently the culture did not support such activities.

These are a few of the strategies which have been working. Now, these are some ideas which will move us ahead into the next decade. If we're serious about faculty development, we've got to focus on the individual, on the institution, on higher education and the state it's in today, and on the world and social problems.

Let me see if I can tie it up.

The Individual. Faculty members in their 50's need particular attention and assistance. The bulk of these people--of us--cluster around the age of 50, give or take a few years. This means that our value systems as persons were greatly affected by the events of the depression years. We are a security-oriented group. Our ruts are deep. The phenomena of the mid-life crises for us are particularly painful and related to the effort it takes to crawl out of the deep rut. Support, in the form of faculty development activities which I have described, will enable such persons to explore some of the alternatives available to them.

The Institution. Campus-wide development activities and institutionalization of faculty development are necessary. The primary responsibility for faculty, however, must clearly be in the hands of the department chairperson. It is this person who must be close enough to individual faculty members to pick up on their needs and hopes, and provide continuity through regular conferences and other means of support. Our association has wisely

provided regional development opportunities for department chairs these last three years. Faculty development must be a continuing and regular aspect of the operations of our institutions.

Higher Education. We must be aware of the condition of higher education today. If, as some say, we are fragile, we must find the means to strengthen ourselves. As we clarify our purposes, next steps for us will become clear. We need to look at the value shifts that have come about and intentionally address the implications these have for higher education.

The World. The popular gurus of our day point toward the possibility of "a world that works," and thousands of people follow. There is a hunger for spiritual reality and hope for meaningful long range life on our planet. Solutions to the problems of this planet require people who are technically competent and who are highly motivated.

The big question today is, "How can we obtain the needed resources?" We have access to these resources: the deeper personal resources to meet these challenges. Among these resources are capacities which are rarely tapped except in times of emergency or tragedy: the capacity to commit one's self to an important task; the capacity to faith, to believe in one's self and others; the capacity to create--to put what we have together in new ways; the capacity to love and to see our world as no longer a world where competition is viable, but where collaboration is our only hope for survival.

This is what we must be about.

REFERENCES

[1]Francis, J. B. "How Do We Get There from Here?--Program Design for Faculty Development." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 46 (November/December 1975), 719-732.

[2]Webster, Richard S. "A New Approach to Institutional Renewal: Management Development and Training for Colleges and Universities." Administrative Development in Higher Education. Edited by John Shtogren. Richmond, Va.: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, Inc., 1978.

[3]Edgerton, Russell. "Talent for the 1980s--Social Change and the Redefinition of Baccalaureate Education." Liberal Education, Vol. 64, No. 4 (December 1978), 416-434.

[4]Kyle, Regina M. J. "Faculty in the 80's: Memory, Desire, Signs." Trends 2000, Faculty and the Eighties, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Winter 1979), 3-5.